DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 340 820 UD 028 499

AUTHOR Davidson, Mary E.
TITLE Monitoring Commission for Desegregation Implementation Response to the Annual Desegregation Review, 1988-89, Part I, Volume Two: Systemwide Strategies To Relieve Overcrowding; under the Student Desegregation Plan for the Chicago Public Schools.
INSTITUTION Chicago Public Schools, IL. Monitoring Commission for Desegregation Implementation.
PUB DATE Apr 91
NOTE 32p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Advisory Committees; Annual Reports; *Attendance Patterns; Class Size; *Crowding; Elementary Secondary Education; *Guidelines; Needs Assessment; *Planning Commissions; Residence Requirements; School Demography; *School Desegregation; School Districts; *Urban Schools
IDENTIFIERS *Chicago Public Schools IL

ABSTRACT

This document presents the formal response to the Chicago (Illinois) Board of Education's annual review of desegregation efforts for 1988-89, which addresses strategies to relieve overcrowding. The Commission found that the document is substantial and detailed in nearly all respects, overcrowded schools should stop permitting students who are out-of-attendance area residents to transfer to these schools, and there is some inconsistency in the content of the report for two schools. The following three areas of concern were noted: (1) for 36 of the 67 overcrowded schools, it was recommended that students attending these schools from outside the attendance area be given options to remain at their current overcrowded school or transfer; however, even if all these students did transfer, the school would still be overcrowded; (2) Marti Bilingual, an overcrowded magnet school, should be closely monitored; and (3) the document's matter of fact tone is problematic and numerical goals to address overcrowding should be set for 1994-95. Data are provided in three tables. (JB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED340820

Monitoring Commission for Desegregation Implementation

Response to the

Annual Desegregation Review, 1988-89 - Part I, Volume Two: Systemwide Strategies to Relieve Overcrowding

Under the Student Desegregation Plan for the Chicago Public Schools

April 1991

. Mary E. Davidson
Principal Investigator

. Donn F. Bailey
Commission Chairperson

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

B. Lee Ward CS. Inc.

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC).

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

UD 028 499

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

COMMISSION MEMBERS

Donn F. Bailey, Chairperson

Nancy M. Abbate
Mari C. Fohrman
Carlos Heredia
Gwendolyn Laroche
Henry Martinez
Uthman Muhammad
George E. Riddick
Aida Sanchez
Darthula Young

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR

Mary E. Davidson

COMMISSION CONSULTANTS

Calvin M. Smith, Jr.

COMMISSION STAFF

Alice H. Blackburn
Barb Leebens-Osilaja
Ana L. Tapia

Monitoring Commission for Desegregation Implementation
1819 West Pershing Road
6th Floor East (c)
Chicago, IL 60609
(312) 535-8220

AN EXECUTIVE ABSTRACT

Monitoring Commission for Desegregation Implementation
Monitoring Response:

Annual Desegregation Review, 1988-89 Part I,
Volume Two: Systemwide Strategies to Relieve Overcrowding

under the Student Desegregation Plan
for the Chicago Public Schools

This is the Monitoring Commission's formal response to the Chicago Board of Education's 1988-89 Annual Desegregation Review Part I, Volume Two: Systemwide Strategies to Relieve Overcrowding (ADR Part I, Volume Two). The Consent Decree reached between the Board of Education and the United States Department of Justice in 1980 requires that the ADR Part I be published annually.

Background

The Board uses this document (ADR Part I, Volume Two) and other ADRs to review and evaluate its progress toward improving education of the students in the Chicago Public Schools.

Report Findings

The Chicago Board of Education's Department of Equal Educational Opportunity Programs (DEEOP) presented data on the nature of the overcrowding issue in the Chicago Public Schools. All information presented is done without comment or conclusion. The information was compiled from three sources: the schools' files operating under controlled enrollments, the Overcrowding Committee Report, and the Department of Operations Analysis and Planning Report. The overcrowded schools are listed in Table One along with their respective program and design capacities, racial/ethnic enrollments, the racial/ethnic distribution of students residing in each school attendance areas who are attending another Chicago public school, and the racial/ethnic distribution of students not residing in an overcrowded attendance area, but who are attending an overcrowded Chicago public school.

Monitoring Commission's Analysis

The Monitoring Commission analyzed the 1988-89 ADR Part I, Volume Two and found that the document is substantial and detailed in nearly all aspects. The Commission noted three areas of concern.

The concerns are:

(1.) There are 67 schools that DEEOP has concluded to be overcrowded. In 36 cases, DEEOP recommended that students attending these schools from outside the school attendance areas be given options to remain at their current overcrowded school or transferring to one that is not.

Even if all these students transferred, the schools would still be overcrowded. It makes no sense to allow students to transfer into an overcrowded school.

(2.) Marti Bilingual is listed as an overcrowded school. It is a magnet school with no assigned attendance area.

By way of corrective action, DEEOP recommended that the administrator of the school closely monitor enrollment and discontinue enrolling students beyond capacity.

There is no reasonable explanation for allowing this school to become overcrowded. The enrollment at Marti Bilingual should be closely monitored by DEEOP.

(3.) The tone of this document is too matter-of-fact. The education of 58,788 students, 84 percent of whom are minority students, is being skewed because of overcrowding. Perhaps, DEEOP could set numerical goals to solve or relieve overcrowding by 1994-95.

This 19-page Monitoring Commission response to the 1987-88 ADR Part II was completed under the direction of Dr. Mary E. Davidson, principal investigator, and primary consultant, Dr. Calvin M. Smith. Copies are available at the Monitoring Commission office, 1819 W. Pershing Road, 6th Floor East, Chicago, IL 60609.

MONITORING COMMISSION FOR DESEGREGATION IMPLEMENTATION

Response to the

ANNUAL DESEGREGATION REVIEW, 1988-89
PART I, VOLUME TWO:
SYSTEMWIDE STRATEGIES TO RELIEVE OVERCROWDING

Under the Student Desegregation Plan for
the Chicago Public Schools

Mary E. Davidson, Principal Investigator
Calvin M. Smith, Primary Consultant

April 1991

Prepared under the direction of
Mary E. Davidson, Principal Investigator
Monitoring Commission for
Desegregation Implementation
Chicago Public Schools
Chicago, Illinois

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND 1

II. PURPOSE 2

III. OVERCROWDING DATA 2

IV. COMMISSION FINDINGS 10

V. SUMMARY 17

VI. CONCLUSION 18

LIST OF TABLES

Table One
Schools Involved in the DEEOP 1988-89 Overcrowding Strategy Study 4

Table Two
Schools Determined by DEEOP Analysis to be Overcrowded 8

Table Three
Solutions Being Considered by DEEOP for the Resolution of
Overcrowding in Determined to be so in 1988-89 11

I. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

This report details the response of the Monitoring Commission for Desegregation Implementation (Commission) to the Spring 1989, Annual Desegregation Review: Systemwide Strategies to Relieve Overcrowding (1988-89 ADR: Part I: Volume Two).

Under the September 1980, Consent Decree between the United States Department of Justice and the Chicago Board of Education, the Board agreed to develop and implement a system-wide student desegregation plan. The Board adopted The Comprehensive Student Assignment Plan (the Plan) in January 1982.

The Plan explained what the Board would commit itself to do regarding establishing a desegregation effort that focused on maximizing the voluntary transfer of students and minimizing the mandatory transfer of students.

The overall administration of this effort was assigned to the Department of Equal Educational Opportunity Programs (DEEOP). Since the end of the 1982-83 school year, DEEOP has published a two-part Annual Desegregation Review. The first part of this document details the Board's efforts and results regarding the Student Assignment Component of the Plan. The second part of the ADR reports on the status of Board efforts in the area of required educational programming.

The 1988-89 ADR: Part I was sent to the Federal District Court on September 20, 1989. That document contained two volumes. The second volume deals with relieving the overcrowding of selected Chicago public school sites and as stated earlier, is the subject of this report.

II. PURPOSE

The Commission responds to this report for two reasons. First, the issue of overcrowding was addressed by the Consent Decree, Section 5.1, Page 9 and Section 6. 2, Page 10, as a part of the Comprehensive Student Assignment Plan, Section V. D. 2, Page 299, and therefore, becomes a part of the Commission's charge. Second, the Commission has demonstrated a continuing concern on this issue, especially as it relates to the education of Hispanic students that goes beyond the mere functional responsibility outlined above. Therefore, the Commission senses a deeper accountability and feels obligated to respond to this DEEOP report on the nature of the overcrowding issue in the Chicago Public Schools. This obligation is the ultimate basis for reporting Commission reaction in an attempt to better inform the Chicago community on the scope of this issue.

III. OVERCROWDING DATA

The Department of Equal Educational Opportunity Programs has provided the reader with a number of data sets on the nature of the overcrowding issue in the Chicago Public Schools. All the information presented is done without comment or conclusion. However, the contents of this report are thorough and to the point. The Commission has found all the information it needs to respond to this portion of the 1988-89 ADR Part I.

The Commission will present three sets of DEEOP data most relevant to the overcrowding issue and DEEOP's response to that issue. These three data sets are: (1) Table One - A listing of overcrowded schools that DEEOP subjected to further analysis

prior to finalizing their overcrowded status; (2) Table Two - A listing of overcrowded schools that DEEOP ultimately determined to be overcrowded; and, (3) Table Three - A listing of overcrowded schools and DEEOP's suggestions for 1989-90 in each school to ease overcrowding. After a short discussion of this DEEOP data, the Commission will provide its findings and reactions to the presented DEEOP data.

The Commission perceives this first complete report on the overcrowding issue to be a baseline scenario. As such, the Commission only will present the salient aspects of the presented data.

Basically, DEEOP determined from three principal system sources: from files of schools operating under controlled enrollment, the Overcrowding Committee Report, and the Department of Operations Analysis and Planning Report, that reported there were possibly 80 overcrowded school sites in the Chicago Public Schools. These schools are listed in Table One along with their respective program and design capacities, racial/ethnic enrollments, the racial/ethnic distribution of students residing in each school attendance area who are attending another Chicago Public School, and the racial/ethnic distribution of students not residing in an overcrowded school attendance area but who are attending an overcrowded Chicago public school.

These 80 schools were subjected to further analysis in order to determine if they were truly overcrowded and if not, why not? This second analysis revealed that there were 12 schools that were not overcrowded. These schools are: Stockton CPC, Ferguson CPC, Delano CPC, Johnson CPC, Farren CPC, Woodson CPC, Wheatley CPC, Shedd Branch, Lovett, Bunche, Hayt, and Henderson. Last, the Sherman School also may no longer be

TABLE ONE

SCHOOLS INVOLVED IN THE DEEOP 1988-89 OVERCROWDING STRATEGY STUDY

SCHOOL	DESIGN CAPACITY	PROGRAM CAPACITY	TOTAL ENROLLMENT					STUDENTS RESIDING BUT ATTENDING ELSEWHERE						STUDENTS ATTENDING BUT RESIDING ELSEWHERE					
			W	B	H	O	T	W	B	H	A/I	A/PI	T	W	B	H	A/I	A/PI	T
ARMOUR	480	481	194	1	401	4	600	34	1	32	3	25	95	26	3	22	0	0	51
ARMSTRONG	750	545	179	323	178	91	771	57	50	35	2	32	176	11	18	10	1	16	56
AVONDALE	870	721	117	51	810	29	1007	49	11	120	0	8	188	1	3	33	0	1	38
BARNARD	360	254	130	262	19	2	413	45	70	1	0	0	116	95	18	25	0	2	140
BATEMAN	960	810	351	32	487	153	1023	79	3	78	10	34	204	9	4	21	0	5	19
BRENTANO	1230	1195	177	69	970	12	1228	47	15	114	6	6	188	17	38	284	3	2	344
BRYN MAWR	1345	1128	0	1571	0	0	1571	15	408	1	4	4	433	2	224	1	0	0	227
BUNCHE	825	707	0	828	0	0	828	2	73	0	0	0	75	1	209	0	0	1	211
BURNS	840	470	8	19	990	0	1017	4	44	208	0	1	257	1	1	52	0	0	54
BYFORD	600	523	2	626	9	0	637	6	406	8	0	3	423	0	11	0	0	0	11
CAMERON	1260	871	24	772	767	1	1564	15	351	217	1	3	587	0	27	14	0	0	40
CARDENAS	525	420	11	11	906	0	928	2	38	136	0	1	177	0	0	11	0	0	11
CARROLL ROSE	120	120	36	111	11	2	160	13	15	2	1	1	32	3	27	1	0	0	31
CHAPPELL	160	132	211	7	181	5	453	38	2	16	1	2	59	3	1	5	0	10	19
CHASE	490	NO DATA	74	34	650	0	758	7	12	52	0	1	72	0	0	20	0	0	20
COLUMBUS	330	229	63	14	310	11	398	21	2	29	0	0	52	21	6	78	1	5	111
COOPER	660	396	10	1	947	0	958	6	10	359	0	0	375	0	0	45	0	0	45
CORKERY	840	612	17	223	677	1	918	2	285	75	0	0	362	1	12	75	0	0	88
DELANO CPC	180	152	0	181	0	0	181	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	181	0	0	0	181
FALCONER	1020	706	346	74	296	17	733	40	0	32	2	5	79	19	53	37	0	0	109
FARREN CPC	150	150	0	170	0	0	170	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	173	0	0	1	175
FERGUSON CPC	180	155	1	184	0	0	185	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	188	1	0	0	0
FIELD	960	698	125	499	338	119	1081	34	59	24	3	46	166	21	34	36	1	18	110
FULTON	NO DATA	NO DATA	NO	DATA	*****	*****	*****	NO	DATA	NO	DATA	NO	DATA	NO	DATA	NO	DATA	NO	DATA
FUNSTON	720	388	43	138	702	1	884	44	169	434	3	2	652	0	5	35	0	0	40
GALE	720	375	94	559	266	16	935	31	78	22	0	17	148	45	9	2	0	2	62
GARY	1650	1412	15	0	1908	0	1923	24	3	176	0	0	203	0	0	63	0	0	63
GOETHE	975	659	91	69	838	7	1005	11	16	49	0	1	77	0	3	33	0	1	37
HAMLINE	690	489	61	32	654	7	754	23	69	62	0	1	155	0	3	8	0	0	11
HAMMOND	600	343	9	14	910	1	914	8	9	162	0	2	181	0	0	22	0	0	22
HANSON PARK	765	525	310	71	314	27	722	20	2	36	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
HAY C. A.	990	628	0	1029	3	4	1036	2	343	7	0	0	352	0	31	0	0	0	31
HAYT	705	544	210	133	223	172	738	129	56	40	3	95	323	10	10	15	0	2	62
HEALY	930	632	318	78	280	328	1004	52	8	22	0	52	134	53	54	28	0	122	262

TABLE ONE

SCHOOL	DESIGN CAPACITY	PROGRAM CAPACITY	TOTAL ENROLLMENT					STUDENTS RESIDING BUT ATTENDING ELSEWHERE						STUDENTS ATTENDING BUT RESIDING ELSEWHERE					
			W	B	H	O	T	W	B	H	A/I	A/PI	T	W	B	H	A/I	A/PI	T
HEDGES	390	667	88	87	929	0	1104	62	32	255	0	0	351	0	0	9	0	0	9
HENDERSON	960	845	0	931	0	0	931	2	153	9	0	0	164	0	60	1	0	0	61
HENRY	660	520	245	28	351	78	702	45	5	52	2	14	118	8	9	16	0	5	38
HIBBARD	1050	715	202	33	255	263	753	111	82	273	2	218	686	3	2	4	0	3	12
JOHNSON CPC	120	72	0	138	0	0	138	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	134	0	0	0	134
JUNGMAN	690	405	4	3	539	0	546	7	7	236	1	1	252	0	0	75	0	0	75
KOMENSKY	420	121	2	1	513	0	516	0	1	73	0	0	74	0	0	0	0	0	0
KOSCIUSZKO	960	521	130	32	961	3	1126	17	9	100	0	0	126	4	0	5	0	0	9
LEWIS	660	605	24	582	79	4	689	16	765	46	0	2	829	0	27	3	0	0	30
LINNE	540	420	249	22	480	22	777	25	4	57	2	3	91	23	7	59	3	0	92
LLOYD	720	662	148	19	475	15	657	76	64	307	3	7	457	8	1	12	0	1	22
LOVETT	630	583	25	379	58	10	472	42	168	45	1	6	262	0	2	0	0	0	2
MARQUETTE	1035	880	435	147	443	5	1030	248	78	144	0	6	476	7	13	10	0	0	30
MARTI	120	103	6	32	73	13	124	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	28	75	3	17	132
McCORMICK	1050	752	12	0	1013	0	1025	0	0	44	0	0	44	3	2	341	0	0	346
McKAY	705	651	109	497	220	15	841	40	87	33	4	9	173	3	14	2	0	2	21
McPHERSON	900	638	288	60	668	109	1125	43	12	74	6	18	153	13	3	58	2	2	78
MITCHELL	540	354	111	17	464	1	593	17	9	10	0	0	36	5	0	32	0	0	37
MONROE	780	706	167	29	704	22	922	53	21	140	4	3	221	5	1	14	0	1	21
MOOS	750	351	53	66	720	13	853	9	23	76	1	3	112	5	9	59	0	1	74
MORRILL	960	856	242	165	698	5	1110	62	39	47	0	2	150	0	0	7	0	1	8
MOZART	705	471	67	26	625	7	725	69	65	573	2	7	716	2	3	24	0	0	29
NIGHTINGALE	840	625	283	65	514	13	875	34	7	41	1	1	84	16	8	19	0	0	43
NIXON	1020	819	94	20	1204	12	1011	61	19	598	4	11	693	0	0	16	0	1	17
NOBEL	960	785	46	161	635	1	843	16	245	317	1	4	583	0	5	11	0	0	16
OGELSBY	690	543	0	827	0	0	827	1	208	1	0	0	210	0	124	0	0		124
PEIRCE	750	426	137	120	483	188	878	58	37	59	2	36	192	3	3	13	0	12	31
PICKARD	570	268	32	2	844	0	878	37	2	171	0	0	210	0	0	11	0	0	11
PILSEN	960	245	18	19	964	0	1001	0	3	105	0	0	108	0	0	0	0	0	0
POWELL	630	535	1	713	2	3	719	13	492	5	0	0	511	0	65	0	0	0	65
PRESCOTT	510	301	58	25	405	2	490	24	6	23	1	1	55	5	14	190	1	1	211
SEWARD	780	449	74	0	1082	1	1157	19	3	261	0	3	286	2	0	42	0	0	44
SHEDD BRANCH	210	184	0	195	0	0	195	2	24	0	0	0	26	0	61	0	0	3	64
SHERMAN	960	709	0	718	11	0	729	3	410	3	0	0	416	2	3	24	0	0	29

TABLE ONE

SCHOOL	DESIGN CAPACITY	PROGRAM CAPACITY	TOTAL ENROLLMENT					STUDENTS RESIDING BUT ATTENDING ELSEWHERE						STUDENTS ATTENDING BUT RESIDING ELSEWHERE					
			W	B	H	O	T	W	B	H	A/I	A/PI	T	W	B	H	A/I	A/PI	T
SHIELDS	980	657	375	4	458	11	848	131	1	94	2	5	233	7	1	13	0	0	21
SPRY	1140	655	23	65	1360	3	1451	16	51	483	2	3	555	2	1	241	0	0	244
STOCKTON CPC	120	107	30	36	57	16	139	0	0	0	0	0	0	30	38	61	1	15	145
SULLIVAN	660	511	13	233	531	1	778	22	59	66	0	0	147	3	7	16	0	0	26
SWIFT	720	460	80	485	103	121	789	46	122	65	5	47	285	7	27	5	1	12	52
TONTI	630	491	392	42	244	6	684	96	5	32	2	5	140	5	42	16	0	0	63
VOLTA	870	749	300	25	140	276	741	81	19	99	1	87	287	26	0	4	0	7	37
VON HUMBOLDT	1575	966	24	333	858	2	1217	5	107	226	0	0	338	0	9	40	0	0	49
WALSH	450	168	14	15	453	0	482	7	1	44	0	0	52	3	2	145	0	0	150
WHEATLEY CPC	150	150	0	283	0	0	283	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	309	0	0	0	309
WHITNEY	750	533	30	0	1073	2	1105	24	2	506	0	0	532	0	0	7	0	0	7
WHITTIER	450	297	21	4	448	1	474	16	2	376	1	0	395	2	0	28	0	0	30
WOODSON CPC	120	120	0	137	0	0	137	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	143	0	0	0	143
YOUNG	1140	986	17	811	92	7	927	12	1047	49	0	2	1110	0	27	8	0	0	35

overcrowded. It appears that DEEOP has determined that controlled enrollment was suspended at this site in 1987. These schools and relevant enrollment data are displayed in Table One. The remaining schools were determined to be truly overcrowded. They are listed in Table Two and are accompanied by enrollment data that is identical to that found in Table One.

Table Three contains the schools that DEEOP determined to be overcrowded and suggested a strategy for dealing with each overcrowded school. The Commission was able to collect this data from pages 15 through 72 of Volume Two of the 1988-89 ADR Part I. The primary suggestion tendered by DEEOP was, "out-of-attendance area students will be given the option of remaining in their present school, transferring to their attendance area school, or transferring to an underutilized school."

This suggested strategy for dealing with the overcrowding issue is listed for 30 schools and in combination with, "discontinue enrolling students outside the attendance area," in an additional eight instances. Continuing controlled enrollment also is an often used strategy as is recommending the continuation of renting a specific non-Chicago public school site (See Table Three).

Also, longer range strategies are suggested by DEEOP. These almost always related to the five-year capital improvement program and resulting school construction. Again, these are baseline intentions and will be monitored as such.

TABLE TWO

SCHOOLS DETERMINED BY DEEOP ANALYSIS TO BE OVERCROWDED

SCHOOL	DESIGN CAPACITY	PROGRAM CAPACITY	TOTAL ENROLLMENT					STUDENTS RESIDING BUT ATTENDING ELSEWHERE						STUDENTS ATTENDING BUT RESIDING ELSEWHERE					
			W	B	H	O	T	W	B	H	A/I	A/PI	T	W	B	H	A/I	A/PI	T
ARMOUR	480	481	194	1	401	4	600	34	1	32	3	25	95	26	3	22	0	0	51
ARMSTRONG	750	545	179	323	178	91	771	57	50	35	2	32	176	11	18	10	1	16	56
AVONDALE	870	721	117	51	810	29	1007	49	11	120	0	8	188	1	3	33	0	1	38
BARNARD	360	254	130	262	19	2	413	45	70	1	0	0	116	95	18	25	0	2	140
BATEMAN	960	810	351	32	487	153	1023	79	3	78	10	34	204	9	4	21	0	5	19
BRENTANO	1230	1195	177	69	970	12	1228	47	15	114	6	6	188	17	38	284	3	2	344
BRYN MAWR	1345	1128	0	1571	0	0	1571	15	408	1	4	4	433	2	224	1	0	0	227
BURNS	840	470	8	19	990	0	1017	4	44	208	0	1	257	1	1	52	0	0	54
BYFORD	600	523	2	626	9	0	637	6	406	8	0	3	423	0	11	0	0	0	11
CAMERON	1260	871	24	772	767	1	1564	15	351	217	1	3	587	0	27	14	0	0	40
CARDENAS	525	420	11	11	906	0	928	2	38	136	0	1	177	0	0	11	0	0	11
CARROLL ROSE	120	120	36	111	11	2	160	13	15	2	1	1	32	3	27	1	0	0	31
CHAPPELL	160	132	211	7	181	5	453	38	2	16	1	2	59	3	1	5	0	10	19
CHASE	490	NO DATA	74	34	650	0	758	7	12	52	0	1	72	0	0	20	0	0	20
COLUMBUS	330	229	63	14	310	11	398	21	2	29	0	0	52	21	6	78	1	5	111
COOPER	660	396	10	1	947	0	958	6	10	359	0	0	375	0	0	45	0	0	45
CORKERY	840	612	17	223	677	1	918	2	285	75	0	0	362	1	12	75	0	0	88
FALCONER	1020	706	346	74	296	17	733	40	0	32	2	5	79	19	53	37	0	0	109
FIELD	960	698	125	499	338	119	1081	34	59	24	3	46	166	21	34	36	1	18	110
FULTON	NO DATA	NO DATA	NO DATA					NO DATA						NO DATA					
FUNSTON	720	388	43	138	702	1	884	44	169	434	3	2	652	0	5	35	0	0	40
GALE	720	375	94	559	266	16	935	31	78	22	0	17	148	45	9	2	0	2	62
GARY	1650	1412	15	0	1908	0	1923	24	3	176	0	0	203	0	0	63	0	0	63
GOETHE	975	659	91	69	838	7	1005	11	16	49	0	1	77	0	3	33	0	1	37
HAMLINE	690	489	61	32	654	7	754	23	69	62	0	1	155	0	3	8	0	0	11
HAMMOND	600	343	9	14	910	1	914	8	9	162	0	2	181	0	0	22	0	0	22
HANSON PARK	765	525	310	71	314	27	722	20	2	36	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
HAY C. A.	990	628	0	1029	3	4	1036	2	343	7	0	0	352	0	31	0	0	0	31
HEALY	930	632	318	78	280	328	1004	52	8	22	0	52	134	53	54	28	0	122	262
HEDGES	390	667	88	87	929	0	1104	62	32	255	0	0	351	0	0	9	0	0	9
HENRY	660	520	245	28	351	78	702	45	5	52	2	14	118	8	9	16	0	5	38
HIBBARD	1050	715	202	33	255	263	753	111	82	273	2	218	686	3	2	4	0	3	12

TABLE TWO

SCHOOL	DESIGN CAPACITY	PROGRAM CAPACITY	TOTAL ENROLLMENT					STUDENTS RESIDING BUT ATTENDING ELSEWHERE						STUDENTS ATTENDING BUT RESIDING ELSEWHERE					
			W	B	H	O	T	W	B	H	A/I	A/PI	T	W	B	H	A/I	A/PI	T
JUNGMAN	690	405	4	3	539	0	546	7	7	236	1	1	252	0	0	75	0	0	75
KOMENSKY	420	121	2	1	513	0	516	0	1	73	0	0	74	0	0	0	0	0	0
KOSCIUSZKO	960	521	130	32	961	3	1126	17	9	100	0	0	126	4	0	5	0	0	9
LEWIS	660	605	24	582	79	4	689	16	765	46	0	2	829	0	27	3	0	0	30
LINNE	540	420	249	22	480	22	777	25	4	57	2	3	91	23	7	59	3	0	92
LLOYD	720	662	148	19	475	15	657	76	64	307	3	7	457	8	1	12	0	1	22
MARQUETTE	1035	880	435	147	443	5	1030	248	78	144	0	6	476	7	13	10	0	0	30
MARTI	120	103	6	32	73	13	124	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	28	75	3	17	132
McCORMICK	1050	752	12	0	1013	0	1025	0	0	44	0	0	44	3	2	341	0	0	346
McKAY	705	651	109	497	220	15	841	40	87	33	4	9	173	3	14	2	0	2	21
McPHERSON	900	638	288	60	668	109	1125	43	12	74	6	18	153	13	3	58	2	2	78
MITCHELL	540	354	111	17	464	1	593	17	9	10	0	0	36	5	0	32	0	0	37
MONROE	780	706	167	29	704	22	922	53	21	140	4	3	221	5	1	14	0	1	21
MOOS	750	351	53	66	720	13	853	9	23	76	1	3	112	5	9	59	0	1	74
MORRILL	960	856	242	165	698	5	1110	62	39	47	0	2	150	0	0	7	0	1	8
MOZART	705	471	67	26	625	7	725	69	65	573	2	7	716	2	3	24	0	0	29
NIGHTINGALE	840	625	283	65	514	13	875	34	7	41	1	1	84	16	8	19	0	0	43
NIXON	1020	819	94	20	1204	12	1011	61	19	598	4	11	693	0	0	16	0	1	17
NOBEL	960	785	46	161	635	1	843	16	245	317	1	4	583	0	5	11	0	0	16
OGELSBY	690	543	0	827	0	0	827	1	208	1	0	0	210	0	124	0	0	0	124
PEIRCE	750	426	137	120	483	188	878	58	37	59	2	36	192	3	3	13	0	12	31
PICKARD	570	268	32	2	844	0	878	37	2	171	0	0	210	0	0	11	0	0	11
PILSEN	960	245	18	19	964	0	1001	0	3	105	0	0	108	0	0	0	0	0	0
POWELL	630	535	1	713	2	3	719	13	492	5	0	0	511	0	65	0	0	0	65
PRESCOTT	510	301	58	25	405	2	490	24	6	23	1	1	55	5	14	190	1	1	211
SEWARD	780	449	74	0	1082	1	1157	19	3	261	0	3	286	2	0	42	0	0	44
SHIELDS	980	657	375	4	458	11	848	131	1	94	2	5	233	7	1	13	0	0	21
SPRY	1140	655	23	65	1360	3	1451	16	51	483	2	3	555	2	1	241	0	0	244
SULLIVAN	660	511	13	233	531	1	778	22	59	56	0	0	147	3	7	16	0	0	26
SWIFT	720	460	80	485	103	121	789	46	122	65	5	47	285	7	27	5	1	12	52
TONTI	630	491	392	42	244	6	684	96	5	32	2	5	140	5	42	16	0	0	63
VOLTA	870	749	300	25	140	276	741	81	19	99	1	87	287	26	0	4	0	7	37
VON HUMBOLDT	1575	966	24	333	858	2	1217	5	107	226	0	0	338	0	9	40	0	0	49
WALSH	450	168	14	15	453	0	482	7	1	44	0	0	52	3	2	145	0	0	150
WHITNEY	750	533	30	0	1073	2	1105	24	2	506	0	0	532	0	0	7	0	0	7
WHITTIER	450	297	21	4	448	1	474	16	2	376	1	0	395	2	0	28	0	0	30
YOUNG	1140	986	17	811	92	7	927	12	1047	49	0	2	1110	0	27	8	0	0	35
TOTALS	52550	37629	7630	12505	36925	2063	58788	2348	6220	8670	111	745	18014	507	1039	2591	16	250	4391
% OF THE TOTAL			13%	21%	63%	4%		11%	35%	48%	1%	4%		12%	24%	59%	0%	6%	

IV. COMMISSION FINDINGS

An examination of Table Two reveals that there are 67 Chicago public schools that DEEOP determined to be overcrowded during the 1988-89 school year. These schools enrolled 58,788 students and had total design and program capacities of 52,550 and 37,629 students respectively. The Commission also determined that there were 18,014 students residing in the attendance areas of these schools who are attending another Chicago public school and 4,391 students residing outside the attendance areas of these overcrowded schools but who were attending them anyway. Presumably, they were attending under the auspices of some form of sanctioned student transfer. Last, the Commission determined that 62.8 percent of the total enrollment of these schools was Hispanic; 21.3 percent was comprised of black students; 13.0 percent were white students; with 3.9 percent classified as "other" students.

The Commission wondered why DEEOP is not mandating that these overcrowded schools stop permitting students who are out-of-attendance area residents to transfer into these schools. Even if all out-of-attendance area students left these schools, overcrowding would continue to exist in each of the 38 schools at focus. Why should administrators at overcrowded schools expend energy to motivate students to voluntarily transfer to another school, if at the same time other students are transferring into that same overcrowded school? Why did DEEOP not recommend stopping, with the exception of Marti Bilingual, all out-of-attendance area transfers into overcrowded schools?

In this same vein, the Commission wonders why out-of-attendance area students are allowed to remain in any overcrowded school. It seems that these students, except for those

TABLE THREE

SOLUTIONS BEING CONSIDERED BY DEEOP FOR THE RESOLUTION OF OVERCROWDING IN DETERMINED TO BE SO IN 1988-89

SCHOOL	1989-90 ACTIONS BEING CONSIDERED BY DEEOP
ARMOUR	Continue leasing Bridgeport Catholic Academy to reduce enrollment by 8 rooms.
ARMSTRONG	Out-of-attendance students will be given the option of remaining in their present school, transferring to their attendance area school, or transferring to an underutilized school.
AVONDALE	Recruit students from Avondale for enrollment in adjacent underutilized schools.
BARNARD	Discontinue enrolling out-of-attendance area minority students for the Options for Knowledge program until the school is within capacity.
BATEMAN	Out-of-attendance students will be given the option of remaining in their present school, transferring to their attendance area school, or transferring to an underutilized school.
BRENTANO	Out-of-attendance students will be given the option of remaining in their present school, transferring to their attendance area school, or transferring to an underutilized school.
BRYN MAWR	Out-of-attendance students will be given the option of remaining in their present school, transferring to their attendance area school, or transferring to an underutilized school.
BURNS	Discontinue enrolling students residing outside the attendance area. Out-of-attendance students will be given the option of remaining in their present school, transferring to their attendance area school, or transferring to an underutilized school.
BYFORD	Continue controlled enrollment, at Byford School, implemented April 3, 1983.
CAMERON	Contiue controlled enrollment to reduce overcrowding at Cameron.
CARDENAS	Encourage the transfer of students from Cardenas to underutilized schools in District 10.
CARROLL ROSE	Discontinue enrolling students residing outside the attendance area. Out-of-attendance students will be given the option of remaining in their present school, transferring to their attendance area school, or transferring to an underutilized school.
CHAPPELL	Out-of-attendance students will be given the option of remaining in their present school, transferring to their attendance area school, or transferring to an underutilized school.
CHASE	Out-of-attendance students will be given the option of remaining in their present school, transferring to their attendance area school, or transferring to an underutilized school.

TABLE THREE

SOLUTIONS BEING CONSIDERED BY DEEOP FOR THE RESOLUTION OF OVERCROWDING IN DETERMINED TO BE SO IN 1988-89

COLUMBUS	Out-of-attendance students will be given the option of remaining in their present school, transferring to their attendance area school, or transferring to an underutilized school.
COOPER	Discontinue enrolling students residing outside the attendance area. Out-of-attendance students will be given the option of remaining in their present school, transferring to their attendance area school, or transferring to an underutilized school.
CORKERY	Encourage the transfer of students from Cardenas to underutilized schools in District 10.
FALCONER	Discontinue enrolling students residing outside the attendance area. Consider modifying the existing program.
FIELD	Out-of-attendance students will be given the option of remaining in their present school, transferring to their attendance area school, or transferring to an underutilized school, except for eighth grade students.
FULTON	Continue leasing St. Basil School to reduce enrollment by 9 rooms.
FUNSTON	Continue leasing St. Augustine College to reduce enrollment at Funston.
GALE C.A.	Out-of-attendance students will be given the option of remaining in their present school, transferring to their attendance area school, or transferring to an underutilized school.
GARY	Discontinue enrolling students residing outside the attendance area. Out-of-attendance students will be given the option of remaining in their present school, transferring to their attendance area school, or transferring to an underutilized school.
GOETHE	Out-of-attendance students will be given the option of remaining in their present school, transferring to their attendance area school, or transferring to an underutilized school.
HAMLINE	Continue leasing St. Rose of Lima School to reduce enrollment by 6 rooms.
HAMMOND	Discontinue enrolling students residing outside the attendance area. Out-of-attendance students will be given the option of remaining in their present school, transferring to their attendance area school, or transferring to an underutilized school.
HANSON PARK	Continue controlled enrollment at Hanson Park implemented April 3, 1983.
HEALY	Discontinue enrolling students residing outside the attendance area. Out-of-attendance students will be given the option of remaining in their present school, transferring to their attendance area school, or transferring to an underutilized school.

TABLE THREE

SOLUTIONS BEING CONSIDERED BY DEEOP FOR THE RESOLUTION OF OVERCROWDING IN DETERMINED TO BE SO IN 1988-89

HEDGES	Continue leasing S. S. Cyril and Methodius Schools to reduce enrollment 8 rooms.
HENRY	Reduce enrollment by encouraging transfers to schools with available space and where the transfers adhere to the 60/40% guidelines for transferring students.
HIBBARD	Continue controlled enrollment until enrollment is within space limitations.
JUNGMAN	Continue leasing ST. Procopius School to reduce enrollment by 6 rooms.
KOMENSKY	Out-of-attendance students will be given the option of remaining in their present school, transferring to their attendance area school, or transferring to an underutilized school.
KOSCIUSZKO	Open Birney School as a Scholastic Academy to reduce enrollment at over - crowded schools in Districts 5 and 6.
LEWIS	Contiue controlled enrollment to reduce overcrowding at Lewis.
LINNE	Out-of-attendance students will be given the option of remaining in their present school, transferring to their attendance area school, or transferring to an underutilized school.
LLOYD	Contiue controlled enrollment to reduce overcrowding at Lloyd.
MARQUETTE	Out-of-attendance students will be given the option of remaining in their present school, transferring to their attendance area school, or transferring to an underutilized school.
MARTI	As this school has no attendance area, the administrator should monitor enrollment and discontinue enrolling students beyond capacity.
McKAY	Out-of-attendance students will be given the option of remaining in their present school, transferring to their attendance area school, or transferring to an underutilized school.
MITCHELL	Out-of-attendance students will be given the option of remaining in their present school, transferring to their attendance area school, or transferring to an underutilized school.
MONROE	Out-of-attendance students will be given the option of remaining in their present school, transferring to their attendance area school, or transferring to an underutilized school.
MOOS	Out-of-attendance students will be given the option of remaining in their present school, transferring to their attendance area school, or transferring to an underutilized school.
MORRILL	Continue controlled enrollment at Morrill School. Encourage transfers of students to underutilized schools in adjacent areas.

TABLE THREE

SOLUTIONS BEING CONSIDERED BY DEEOP FOR THE RESOLUTION OF OVERCROWDING IN DETERMINED TO BE SO IN 1988-89

MOZART	Out-of-attendance students will be given the option of remaining in their present school, transferring to their attendance area school, or transferring to an underutilized school.
NIGHTINGALE	Out-of-attendance students will be given the option of remaining in their present school, transferring to their attendance area school, or transferring to an underutilized school.
NIXON	Out-of-attendance students will be given the option of remaining in their present school, transferring to their attendance area school, or transferring to an underutilized school.
NOBEL	Out-of-attendance students will be given the option of remaining in their present school, transferring to their attendance area school, or transferring to an underutilized school.
OGELSBY	Out-of-attendance students will be given the option of remaining in their present school, transferring to their attendance area school, or transferring to an underutilized school.
PEIRCE	Out-of-attendance students will be given the option of remaining in their present school, transferring to their attendance area school, or transferring to an underutilized school.
PICKARD	Discontinue enrolling students residing outside the attendance area.
POWELL	Out-of-attendance students will be given the option of remaining in their present school, transferring to their attendance area school, or transferring to an underutilized school.
PRESCOTT	Out-of-attendance students will be given the option of remaining in their present school, transferring to their attendance area school, or transferring to an underutilized school.
SEWARD	Encourage transfers from Seward to other Options programs in underutilized schools in District 13.
SHERMAN	Controlled enrollment at Sherman was suspended in 1987.
SHIELDS	Discontinue enrolling students residing outside the attendance area. Out-of-attendance students will be given the option of remaining in their present school, transferring to their attendance area school, or transferring to an underutilized school.
SPRY	Discontinue enrolling students residing outside the attendance area. Out-of-attendance students will be given the option of remaining in their present school, transferring to their attendance area school, or transferring to an underutilized school.

TABLE THREE

SOLUTIONS BEING CONSIDERED BY DEEOP FOR THE RESOLUTION OF OVERCROWDING IN DETERMINED TO BE SO IN 1988-89

SULLIVAN	Out-of-attendance students will be given the option of remaining in their present school, transferring to their attendance area school, or transferring to an underutilized school.
SWIFT	Out-of-attendance students will be given the option of remaining in their present school, transferring to their attendance area school, or transferring to an underutilized school.
TONTI	Out-of-attendance students will be given the option of remaining in their present school, transferring to their attendance area school, or transferring to an underutilized school.
VOLTA	Continue controlled enrollment until enrollment is within space limitations.
VON HUMBOLTD	Out-of-attendance students will be given the option of remaining in their present school, transferring to their attendance area school, or transferring to an underutilized school.
WALSH	Discontinue enrolling students residing outside the attendance area.
WHITNEY	Out-of-attendance students will be given the option of remaining in their present school, transferring to their attendance area school, or transferring to an underutilized school.
WHITTIER	Continue leasing Our Lady of Vilna School to reduce enrollment by 8 rooms.
YOUNG	Contiue controlled enrollment to reduce overcrowding at Young.

in their last year of enrollment, should be given a choice of returning to their school of residence or another underutilized school. Under no circumstances does it appear prudent to the Commission to permit these students to chose to remain in an overcrowded school. In the future, DEEOP should consider this action.

The Commission notes that Marti Bilingual is listed as an overcrowded school. Marti Bilingual has no attendance area. The Commission finds no solace in DEEOP's suggested remedy," . . . the administrator should monitor enrollment and discontinue enrolling students beyond capacity." The Commission would have found a more strongly worded statement such as," . . . shall immediately cease over- enrolling the school," more to its liking.

At this point, the Commission observed some inconsistency in the content of the overcrowding report. The Fulton School is listed on page 52 as being overcrowded and still needing nine leased rooms at the St. Basil School. Fulton School is not listed anywhere else in the, "Overcrowded Schools and Recommended Actions" or the subsequent," Overcrowded Schools" section of the report. Therefore, no capacity data or enrollment data are presented for this school. Also, the McPherson School is listed on page 19 but not on page 20 and the Pilsen School is listed on page 37 but not on page 38. Thus, no recommended 1989-90 strategies are detailed in this report for coping with overcrowding in these two schools. These omissions should be addressed via an *errata* sheet.

Though everything presented by DEEOP in this document, except for Marti Bilingual's status, is defensible, the Commission is concerned that there are no numerical goals setforth in this document. There should, at least, be a five-year plan for dealing with this most serious issue. This five-year plan to cope with should contain incremental

numerical goals of significantly reducing the level of overcrowding in the 65 schools contained in this report. There are no listed priorities. This report should have contained a priority listing of schools to be targeted first for enrollment relief. Each priority should be accompanied by actions to be taken to solve the issue of overcrowding. There does not appear to be an abiding recognition by DEEOP that Hispanic students are being disproportionately impacted by this issue. In fact, their education is most disproportionately effected by the overcrowding issue.

This report does not contain any analysis of the continuing impact of current Board of Education policy on overcrowding nor does it even call for an examination of this policy. Why, for example, could DEEOP not analyze and report on the continuing impact of controlled enrollment as a management technique for coping with overcrowding? Why does this practice remain without alteration when it apparently has worked very slowly? DEEOP should ask this and other questions and propose answers.

V. SUMMARY

The Monitoring Commission for Desegregation Implementation has analyzed the 1988-89 ADR Part I: Volume Two and finds that the document is substantial and detailed in nearly all aspects. The Commission has noted three inconsistencies that are easily remedied and has expressed concern with the overall tone of the document and with the nature of DEEOP's recommended solutions to the overcrowded nature of certain schools.

Also, the Commission is concerned that Marti Bilingual School become overcrowded and expressed some displeasure with the lack of a five-year plan for solving the

overcrowding issue; including five-year incremental goals, a prioritized list of overcrowded school problems and solutions, and a discussion of the impact of Board of Education policy on overcrowding and possible amendments to such policy.

VI. CONCLUSION

The Commission concludes the following from its analysis of this DEEOP report:

(1) There are 67 schools that DEEOP has concluded to be overcrowded. In 36 instances, DEEOP recommends that students attending these schools from outside the school attendance area be given options to remain at their current overcrowded school or transferring to one that is not.

Even if all these students transferred, all 38 schools still would be overcrowded.

It makes no educational sense to allow students to transfer into overcrowded school.

(2) Marti Bilingual is listed as an overcrowded school. It is a school with no assigned attendance area. All students can enroll by applying directly at the school. By way of corrective action, DEEOP recommended that the administrator of the school closely monitor enrollment and discontinue enrolling students beyond capacity.

There is no reasonable explanation for allowing the school to become overcrowded. The enrollment at Marti Bilingual should be closely monitored by DEEOP.

(3) The tone of this document is too matter-of-fact. There does not appear to be a sense of urgency on DEEOP's part with regard to truly solving the overcrowding problem. The education of 58,788 students, 84 percent of whom are minority students, is being skewed because of overcrowding. DEEOP should set annual numerical goals to relieve overcrowding.